| 1 2 3 4 5 6 | PAUL J. PASCUZZI, State Bar No. 148810 JASON E. RIOS, State Bar No. 190086 THOMAS R. PHINNEY, State Bar No. 159435 FELDERSTEIN FITZGERALD WILLOUGHBY PASCUZZI & RIOS LLP 500 Capitol Mall, suite 2250 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 329-7400 Facsimile: (916) 329-7435 Email: ppascuzzi@ffwplaw.com jrios@ffwplaw.com | |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| 7 | tphinney@ffwplaw.com | |
| 8 | ORI KATZ, State Bar No. 209561 ALAN H. MARTIN, State Bar No. 132301 AMANDA L. COTTRELL, State Bar No. 36021 | 5 |
| 9 | JEANNIE KIM, State Bar No. 270713 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTO A Limited Liability Partnership Including Prof | ON LLP |
| 11 | Four Embarcadero Center, 17 th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4109 | essional Corporations |
| 12 | Telephone: (415) 434-9100 Facsimile: (415) 434-3947 | |
| 13 | Email: okatz@sheppardmullin.com amartin@sheppardmullin.com acottrell@sheppardmullin.com | |
| 14 | Attorneys for The Roman Catholic Archbishop of | \mathbf{f} |
| 15 | San Francisco | |
| 16 17 | UNITED STATES BA | ANKRUPTCY COURT |
| 18 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFO | ORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION |
| 19 | In re | Case No. 23-30564 |
| 20 | THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO, | Chapter 11 |
| 21 | Debtor and Debtor in Possession. | DEBTOR'S OBJECTION TO THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS' PROPOSED |
| 22 | Debtor in Possession. | FORM OF ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING |
| 23 | | DISCLOSURE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES |
| 24 | | DATE: March 13, 2025 |
| 25 26 | | TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: Courtroom 17 450 Golden Gate Ave. |
| 27 | | San Francisco, CA 94102 |
| 28 | | |

TO THE HONORABLE DENNIS MONTALI, THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED CREDITORS, AND ALL OTHER PARTIES IN INTEREST:

The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco, the debtor and debtor in possession (the "<u>Debtor</u>") in the above-captioned chapter 11 bankruptcy case (the "<u>Case</u>"), objects (the "<u>Objection</u>") to the proposed form of order "as to the Minutes entirely" submitted by the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors (the "<u>Committee Order</u>") to the Court for review and entry on the docket in this Case. For the reasons set forth below, the Debtor respectfully requests that the Court enter that form of order appended to this Objection as Exhibit 1 (the "<u>Debtor Order</u>").²

On March 26, 2025, after notice and a hearing, the Court entered that *Memorandum Decision* on *Motion for Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes and Aggregated* Claims Data [ECF No. 1105] (the "Memorandum Decision").³ Thereafter, the Debtor and the Committee met and conferred regarding the form of proposed orders to submit to the Court in accordance with the Memorandum Decision. While the parties were able to agree on the form of proposed order granting, in part, the Motion as to the Claims Data, the parties were unable to agree on the form of the Committee Order.

OBJECTION TO COMMITTEE ORDER

I.

The Debtor objects to the Committee Order because it would allow for publication of the IRB Minutes <u>without</u> redaction of the names of the (a) members of the IRB, and (b) speakers at the IRB meetings (together, the "<u>IRB Parties</u>"). The Debtor raised the need for such redactions in its Opposition.⁴ In its Reply,⁵ the Committee sought authority to file publicly the Claims Data but

²³ See Memorandum Decision at 10:17-18.

² For the Court's and Committee's ease of review, the Debtor further appends to this Objection as Exhibit 2 a redline comparison of the Debtor Order against the Committee Order.

³ Capitalized terms not otherwise defined in this Objection shall have the same meanings ascribed to them in the Memorandum Decision.

^{4 &}quot;Opposition" means that Debtor's Opposition to the Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' Motion for an Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes and Aggregated Claims Data [ECF No. 1028].

Aggregated Claims Data [ECF No. 1028].

5 "Reply" means that The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' Reply Brief in Support of an Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes And Aggregated Claims Data [ECF No. 1072].

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | |

stated "there is no need to unseal the IRB Minutes at this time." Reply at 1:8-9. Indeed, the Committee acknowledged that it "has already agreed that the IRB Minutes can remain redacted for privilege and personal identity information." Reply at 3:13-14. At the hearing on the Motion, there was much discussion and some confusion regarding the nature and scope of redactions, but neither the parties nor the Court directly addressed the question of redacting specific attribution of statements made during the IRB process to specific IRB Parties in the IRB Minutes. Similarly, the Memorandum Decision does not specifically address this issue.

Given the Committee's acknowledgement in the Reply that it has already agreed that the IRB Minutes can remain redacted for, among other things, personally identifiable information, it is appropriate that the Court's order as to the IRB Minutes accurately reflect that disclosure of the IRB Minutes shall be limited and <u>not</u> disclose or reference attribution of statements made by the IRB Parties. The IRB Parties are not perpetrators of abuse. They are primarily, but not exclusively, lay people who voluntarily participate in the IRB process. They include a survivor of abuse, a member of law enforcement, a psychologist and others.

While the identity of the members of the IRB is already public, what is not public and should not be made public is the specific attribution of statements made during the IRB process to specific IRB Parties. Such public disclosure will completely chill this important process and punish those who participated in the past based on a reasonable and good faith expectation of anonymity.

Other than the issue related to redaction of the attribution of statements made by the IRB Parties, the Debtor has no objection to the balance of the Committee Order as to form, while reserving all post-judgment rights. Should the Court have any question regarding the Debtor's specific objection to the Committee Order, it respectfully requests that the Court set a telephonic hearing to allow the parties to be heard.

///

II. 1 2 **CONCLUSION** 3 Wherefore, for all of the reasons stated above, the Debtor respectfully requests that the Court enter the Debtor Order. 4 5 6 Dated: April 4, 2025 7 FELDERSTEIN FITZGERALD WILLOUGHBY PASCUZZI & RIOS LLP 8 9 By /s/ Paul J. Pascuzzi 10 PAUL J. PASCUZZI JASON E. RIOS 11 THOMAS R. PHINNEY 12 Attorneys for The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco 13 14 Dated: April 4, 2025 15 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTON LLP 16 17 By /s/ Ori Katz ORI KATZ 18 AMANDA L. COTTRELL JEANNIE KIM 19 20 Attorneys for The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Exhibit 1 1 [Debtor's Proposed Form of Order] 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT 8 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION Case No. 23-30564 10 In re THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP 11 Chapter 11 OF SAN FRANCISCO, 12 [PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING THE Debtor and OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF 13 Debtor in Possession. UNSECURED CREDITORS' MOTION FOR AN ORDER AUTHORIZING 14 DISCLOSURE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES 15 DATE: March 13, 2025 16 TIME: 1:30 p.m. Courtroom 17 PLACE: 17 450 Golden Gate Ave. San Francisco, CA 94102 18 19 The Court has considered The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' Motion for an 20 Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes and Aggregated Claims Data 21 ("Motion") and supporting documents, the *Debtor's Opposition* to the Motion, the Committee's 22 reply, and the arguments of counsel and evidence adduced regarding the Motion at an in-person 23 hearing on March 13, 2025 before the Court ("Hearing"). Based upon the Court's review of the 24 Motion and all pleadings, evidence, and arguments at the Hearing, and for reasons set forth in the 25 Memorandum Decision on Motion for Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes and Aggregated Claims Data entered March 26, 2025 ("Opinion") [Docket 1105], 1 26 27 28 Capitalized terms not otherwise defined have the meanings ascribed in the Opinion.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Motion is GRANTED as to the IRB Minutes produced in discovery and submitted under seal as Exhibit B to the Michael Declaration.
- 2. The IRB Minutes referenced in paragraph 1 can be made public, subject to the redaction of the names of the members of the IRB and specific attribution of statements to specific IRB members and other speakers at the IRB meetings.
- 3. The Court shall retain jurisdiction over any and all matters arising from the interpretation, implementation, or enforcement of this Order.

*** END OF [PROPOSED] ORDER ***

Exhibit 2 [Redline Comparison of Debtor Order Against Committee Order]

| 1 2 3 4 5 | PAUL J. PASCUZZI, State Bar No. 148810 JASON E. RIOS, State Bar No. 190086 THOMAS R. PHINNEY, State Bar No. 159435 FELDERSTEIN FITZGERALD WILLOUGHBY PASCUZZI & RIOS LLP 500 Capitol Mall, suite 2250 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 329-7400 Facsimile: (916) 329-7435 | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| <u>6</u> | Email: ppascuzzi@ffwplaw.com jrios@ffwplaw.com tphinney@ffwplaw.com | | |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | ORI KATZ, State Bar No. 209561 ALAN H. MARTIN, State Bar No. 132301 AMANDA L. COTTRELL, State Bar No. 36021 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER & HAMPTO A Limited Liability Partnership Including Prof Four Embarcadero Center, 17 th Floor San Francisco, California 94111-4109 Telephone: (415) 434-9100 Facsimile: (415) 434-3947 Email: okatz@sheppardmullin.com amartin@sheppardmullin.com acottrell@sheppardmullin.com | ON LLP | |
| 14 15 | Attorneys for The Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco | f | |
| <u>16</u> | UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT | | |
| <u>17</u> | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION | | |
| <u>18</u> | In re | Case No. 23-30564 | |
| <u>19</u> | THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOP OF SAN FRANCISCO, | Chapter 11 | |
| <u>20</u> | Debtor and | ORDER GRANTING THE OFFICIAL COMMITTEE OF UNSECURED | |
| <u>21</u> | Debtor in Possession. | CREDITORS' MOTION FOR AN[PROPOSED] ORDER | |
| 22 | | AUTHORIZING DISCLOSURE OF INDEPENDENT REVIEW BOARD MINUTES | |
| 23 | | | |
| 24 25 | | DATE: March 13, 2025 TIME: 1:30 p.m. PLACE: Courtroom 17 | |
| <u>26</u> | | 450 Golden Gate Ave. San Francisco, CA 94102 | |
| <u>27</u> | | | |
| <u>28</u> | | | |

| - 1 | |
|-----|---|
| 1 | The Court has considered The Official Committee of Unsecured Creditors' Motion for an |
| 2 | Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes and Aggregated Claims Data |
| 3 | ("Motion") and supporting documents, the <i>Debtor's Opposition</i> to the Motion, the Committee's |
| 4 | reply, and the arguments of counsel and evidence adduced regarding the Motion at an in-person |
| 5 | hearing on March 13, 2025 before the Court ("Hearing"). Based upon the Court's review of the |
| 6 | Motion and all pleadings, evidence, and arguments at the Hearing, and for reasons set forth in the |
| 7 | Memorandum Decision on Motion for Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board |
| 8 | Minutes and Aggregated Claims Data entered March 26, 2025 ("Opinion") [Docket 1105],1 |
| 9 | IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT: |
| 10 | 1. The Motion is GRANTED as to the IRB Minutes produced in discovery and |
| 11 | submitted under seal as Exhibit B to the Michael Declaration. |
| 12 | 2. The IRB Minutes referenced in paragraph 1 can be made public, subject to the |
| 13 | redaction of the names of the members of the IRB and specific attribution of statements to specific |
| 14 | IRB members and other speakers at the IRB meetings. |
| 15 | 3. The Court shall retain jurisdiction over any and all matters arising from the |
| 16 | interpretation, implementation, or enforcement of this Order. |
| 17 | AGREED AS TO FORM: |
| 18 | |
| 19 | Oni Vota Esa |
| 20 | Ori Katz, Esq. Amanda Cottrell, Esq. Counsel to the Debtor |
| 21 | ###- <u>****</u> END OF [PROPOSED] ORDER ### <u>***</u> |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| - 1 | |

 1 Capitalized terms not otherwise defined have the meanings ascribed in the Opinion.

Case

Case No. 23-30564

Summary report:

Litera Compare for Word 11.8.0.56 Document comparison done on 4/4/2025 10:16:41 PM

Style name: SMRH Standard

Intelligent Table Comparison: Active

Original DMS: nd://4906-5582-9809/1/Order Granting the Committee's Motion for Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes.docx

Modified DMS: nd://4906-5582-9809/2/Order Granting the Committee's Motion for Order Authorizing Disclosure of Independent Review Board Minutes.docx

| Changes: | anges: |
|----------|--------|
|----------|--------|

| Add | 19 |
|--|----|
| Delete | 13 |
| Move From | 0 |
| Move To | 0 |
| Table Insert | 0 |
| Table Delete | 0 |
| Table moves to | 0 |
| Table moves from | 0 |
| Embedded Graphics (Visio, ChemDraw, Images etc.) | 0 |
| Embedded Excel | 0 |
| Format changes | 0 |
| Total Changes: | 32 |